

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this Application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed on October 29, 2004. Claims 1-5 are pending in the Application, Claims 1 and 3-5 stand rejected, and Claim 2 stands objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims, but would be allowed if rewritten in independent form. The indication of allowable subject matter is noted with appreciation. Claims 1-5 are amended and new Claims 6-24 are added by the present Amendment.

Based on the Reasons for Allowance in the outstanding Office Action it appears that Claim 3 should also have been identified as allowable. Clarification is respectfully requested.

Summarizing the outstanding Office Action, Applicants' specification was objected to for lacking reference to a previous priority application. Claims 1 and 3-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Swank et al. (U.S. Patent No.5,155,411 hereinafter "Swank").

Applicants thank Examiners Williams and Zimmerman for the courtesy of an interview extended to Applicants' representative on January 5, 2005. During the interview, Amendments to the claims as herein presented were proposed, and arguments as hereinafter developed were presented.

During the interview, as discussed in Applicants' specification, the importance of the location of the projecting bend portion recited in Claims 1 and 5 were discussed. In addition, it was explained that such a feature was neither taught nor disclosed in Swank.

An agreement was reached during the interview that Swank does not teach or disclosed the location of the projecting bend portion. Examiner Williams noted in the interview summary (form PTOL-413) the following: "Discussed claims 1-5 in light of the

Application No. 10/824,514
Reply to Office Action of October 29, 2004

reference to U.S. patent 5,155,411. Examiner agreed to withdraw that reference and update the search upon submission of request for reconsideration.”

Based at least on the foregoing discussion and the results of the personal interview, Applicants respectfully submit that the above-summarized rejection based on Swank is now moot. Its withdrawal is respectfully requested.

Applicants have amended the specification in view of the outstanding objection and respectfully request reconsideration of applicants’ specification.

Finally, Applicants have submitted herein new Claims 6-24, which find non-limiting support on the subject matter disclosed as follows: (1) as to Claims 6-8, on page 13, lines 2-14 of Applicants’ specification; (2) as to Claim 10, on page 14, lines 25-27; (3) as to Claims 11 and 12, on page 18, lines 3-6; (4) as to Claim 13, on Table 2; and (5) as to Claims 14-24, on the subject matter of the originally filed claims and the new Claims 6-13 as just summarized.

The new claims depend either from Claim 1 or Claim 5, incorporating by reference all of the features recited therein. In view of at least the above-presented remarks and their dependency, Applicants respectfully submit that new Claims 6-24 should be allowed over Swank.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal Allowance. A Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-24 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants’ undersigned representatives at the below listed telephone number.

Application No. 10/824,514
Reply to Office Action of October 29, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Registration No. 25,599
Robert T. Pous
Registration No. 29,099
Attorneys of Record

Customer Number

22850

703-413-3000 (telephone)
703-413-2220 (fax)

GJM/RTP/MQM/agm
I:\ATTY\MQM\25\S\251919us\PROP RESP 1-3-05.DOC